

2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Emerging Frontiers in Biological Sciences

Report Run Date: 06/06/2019 12:45:41 AM

1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

2. Fiscal Year

2018

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Proposal Review Panel for Emerging Frontiers in Biological Sciences

3b. GSA Committee No.

44011

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

06/30/2017

6. Expected Renewal Date

06/30/2019

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

Agency Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

12. Specific Establishment Authority

ADM IV-100

13. Effective Date

08/07/2009

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open Meetings and Dates

Purpose

Proposal Review

Start

02/21/2018

End

- 02/23/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 1

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$42,360.00	\$43,000.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$28,818.33	\$30,000.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$12,516.51	\$13,000.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00

18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$3,514.30	\$3,500.00
18d. Total	\$87,209.14	\$89,500.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.18	0.20

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The panel provides the unique opportunity for NSF to receive judgments about the comparative merits within a group of proposals and on the merits of each proposal. Ad hoc mail reviewers can be chosen to give a thorough technical review of a proposal, mail reviewer judgments are normally made about a single proposal viewed in isolation. Panel review has the advantage of allowing open discussion among the members. Teams, such as these, usually arrive at superior decisions when compared to individuals.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Members are selected to be representative of the scientific areas encompassed by the division's activities. Every effort is made to achieve a diverse membership with representation including individuals from underrepresented groups and different geographic regions. Members will be designated as Special Government Employees or Regular Government Employees.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

Estimated Number of Meetings per Year - 1; Total Meetings - 1

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

There is no other standing or ad hoc group that exists that has the blend of backgrounds—technical, institutional and personal—to provide the Division with the necessary technical review of the proposals being considered.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Proposals reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals.

21. Remarks

N/A

Designated Federal Officer

Brent Miller Emerging Frontiers Director

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
-------------------	-------	-----	------------	--------------------

Ballantyne, Ashley	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	The University of Montana	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Biondi, Franco	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of Nevada, Reno	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Cavender-Bares, Jeannine	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of Minnesota Saint Paul	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Couture, John	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Purdue University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Covich, Alan	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of Georgia	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Crowl, Todd	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Florida International University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Glenn, Nancy	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Boise State University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Goldsmith, Greg	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Chapman University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hanson, Paul	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of Wisconsin-Madison	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hladik, Christine	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Georgia Southern University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hulshof, Catherine	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Virginia Commonwealth University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Huntzinger, Deborah	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Northern Arizona University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Jin, Jiming	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Utah State University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Kaushal, Sujay	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of Maryland College Park	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Kelly, John	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Loyola University Chicago	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
LaMontagne, Jalene	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	DePaul University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Ogle, Kiona	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Northern Arizona University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Pilgrim, Melissa	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of South Carolina Upstate	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Rocha, Adrian	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of Notre Dame	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Roehm, Charlotte	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Terralimno LLC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
SanClements, Michael	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	National Ecological Observatory Network	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Soranno, Patricia	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Michigan State Univeristy	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Zimmerman, Naupaka	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	University of San Francisco	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Zipkin, Elise	10/01/2017 09/30/2018	Michigan State University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 24

Narrative Description

The NSF mission is set out in the NSF Act of 1950 authorizes and directs the Agency to initiate and support basic scientific research and research fundamental to the engineering

process, and science and engineering education programs at all levels and in all fields of science and engineering. The involvement of knowledgeable peers from outside the Foundation in the review of proposals is the keystone of NSF's proposal review system. Their judgments of the extent to which proposals address the merit review criteria are vital for informing NSF staff and influencing funding recommendations.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

Not Applicable

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

The use of panelists to review proposals for the Agency is an invaluable asset. The cost of obtaining the expertise, insight, and information received by the Division using alternative methods, such as hiring the expertise as full or part-time employees, would be extremely high.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

177

Number of Recommendations Comments

This is an ongoing committee. Therefore, the number of recommendations produced by the committee is for the fiscal year 2018.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

100%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The word "implement" is not applicable to grant review panels. All recommendations are "considered" by the agency.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Not applicable. Please see answer directly above.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Although panelists may not receive direct feedback, each committee member may use the NSF FastLane, a public web-based program, which provides information on awards made by the agency to determine the outcome of proposals reviewed by the panel.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>

Approved grants or other payments



Other



Action Comments

Not Applicable

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 177

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 21

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$76,939,076

Grant Review Comments

The panelists/advisory committee members provided information on the merit of the proposal, which includes an overall rating. The number of proposals above includes pre-proposals submitted to NSF for review. The pre-proposals are not included in the number of "grants recommend" or "dollar value of grants" recommended for approval.

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO



Online Agency Web Site



Online Committee Web Site



Online GSA FACA Web Site



Publications



Other



Access Comments

Contact DFO.